

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## TRIBUTE TO STEVE STRICKER

HON. THOMAS W. EWING  
OF ILLINOIS

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY  
OF OHIO

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 22, 1996, we the undersigned, Congressmen JOSEPH McDADE, MICHAEL OXLEY, JAMES CLYBURN, and THOMAS EWING, had the privilege of playing golf in the Kemper Pro-Am with Mr. Steve Stricker, the winner of the 1996 Kemper Open.

Mr. Stricker has been a rising star in the professional golfing ranks since joining the pro tour in 1990. With his wife, Nicki, at his side serving as his caddie, he won his first major tournament last Sunday.

Steve Stricker is a graduate of the University of Illinois, in the heart of the 15th Congressional District of Illinois, served by Representative EWING.

Steve Stricker's golfing ability is now a matter of record, and we expect many more great wins on the pro tour. What we also know is that Steve Stricker is a very personable gentleman. We found him to be an extremely polite and considerate young man. Matched with his wife, Nicki, the are, indeed, a great team and a credit to the golfing profession.

We congratulate Steve Stricker for a tremendous victory at the 1996 Kemper Open. We consider it an honor to have met and played a round of golf with such a fine athlete and fine gentleman.

## THE MEDIA'S VETO

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a recent study revealed that the members of the Washington press corps are predominantly liberal. In fact, over 90 percent of them voted Democrat in the last election. Despite these leanings, the media have defended themselves by claiming to be able to separate those opinions from their news coverage.

Quite to the contrary, U.S. News & World Report, of June 10, 1996, takes issue with that argument and provides a case study of how the media's left-leaning perspective often colors the manner in which stories are covered or not covered. The article explains how the Boston Globe, the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, and the Washington Post all overlooked Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN's

statement that the procedure of partial birth abortions was too close to infanticide, and would vote to override the President's veto. I would like to submit this article for the RECORD and note that it ends by challenging reporters and the media to do some hard investigating. I also challenge the media to do so and hope that the American public recognizes the liberal filter through which they receive their news.

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 10, 1996]

## ALL THE NEWS THAT FITS OUR BIASES

(By John Leo)

In a videotaped interview on May 2, Billy Graham told columnist Cal Thomas that he had privately met with President Clinton and criticized him for vetoing the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. This story poked into a few newspapers. The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times gave it a line or two deep in round-up articles. A computer search failed to turn up any mention of it in the New York Times and the Boston Globe.

The same day, Democratic Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York told New York Post reporter Deborah Orin he would vote to override the abortion veto because partial-birth abortions are "too close to infanticide." All four of the above-mentioned newspapers skipped this story. Three weeks later, the New York Times quoted Bob Dole as agreeing with Moynihan—which must have mystified Times readers who don't also read the New York Post, since they hadn't yet been informed about Moynihan's stance. Even an editorial barb in the Wall Street Journal about the nonreporting of Moynihan's comment had no effect.

It's particularly strange for the Times to ignore an anti-veto stance by a hometown senator who has a prominent abortion-rights record. This is like Jesse Helms attacking the tobacco industry and getting no ink in North Carolina papers.

Of course, in the daily rush of breaking news, many stories fall by the wayside. But some stories are stronger candidates for the wayside than others. Among the sure-fire wayside candidates are reports that some hospitals have limited second-trimester abortions because nurses refused to attend the procedures; all stories about health violations at abortion clinics or the large number of antiabortion Democrats; and most stories about savage treatment of abortion protesters.

## DEEP SENTIMENTS

Elizabeth Fox-Genovese of Emory University charges that the American press has underrepresented the depth of antiabortion sentiment in America. This is happening again with the partial-birth issue. Though the media keep representing opposition as essentially religious and Republican, a Gallup Poll shows that a majority of Americans support the ban (57 percent for it, 39 percent against). A more partisan poll conducted by the Tarrance Group for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops found that 55 percent of Democrats and 65 percent of those identifying themselves as pro choice supported the ban.

On the broader issue of abortion, Mary Ann Glendon of Harvard Law School has charged that by misrepresenting the sweeping character of *Roe v. Wade* for so long (despite its

famous trimester divisions, it actually allows women to abort at any time during the nine months of gestation), the media have effectively drained away a lot of potential reform sentiment.

And David Shaw, the Pulitzer-winning media critic of the Los Angeles Times, in his long, four-part 1990 series on media coverage of the abortion issue, concluded that reportage on this touchy subject has been uniquely biased across the board toward abortion rights. This was a very serious indictment, one that the media should have felt some obligation to address but didn't. Shaw's series was photocopied and passed around widely, but the media essentially gave it the silent treatment. Neither of the nation's two leading journalism reviews has ever written about Shaw's findings or taken up the bias issue on its own.

If he wished to return to the subject, Shaw would have a field day with coverage of the partial-birth issue. Much of it has stayed remarkably close to the arguments and position papers put out by the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Many have accepted at face value Kate Michelman's claim that anesthesia kills the fetus before the procedure begins. Few reporters bothered to add that the head of the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Norig Ellison, says it isn't so—"very little of the anesthetic given the mother ever reaches the fetus."

Honest reporting would also say flatly that abortion opponents are right to say that a ban on partial-birth abortions with an exception for "health" of the mother is no ban at all. The language is right there in *Doe v. Bolton* (1973), the case in which the Supreme Court defined health as any physical or emotional problem.

Is this procedure confined to serious genetic defects or cases of serious risk to the mother, as Clinton thinks? Well, no. Some news reports seem to take Michelman's argument at face value ("it's a lie" that the procedure is used when a mother's "depression" or an infant's potential cleft palate is cited as justification). The rest leave Michelman's claim unexamined and add a line like, "Foes of the procedure argue it is used to perform elective abortions."

But two leading practitioners of this procedure have said elective use is not unusual. Dr. Martin Haskell told an interviewer from American Medical News: "I'll be quite frank: Most of my abortions are elective in that 20-to-24-week range. . . . 80 percent are purely elective." And James McMahon said he had performed partial-birth abortions for an array of reasons, including depression and cleft palate. If antiabortion activists were making the sort of dubious and clearly false claims that are coming out of NARAL, the media would do some hard investigating. Why can't more reporters bring themselves to do it now?

## SALUTE TO CALLE MAYOR MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. JANE HARMAN  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to salute Calle Mayor Middle School in Torrance,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.